

Mr. DASCHLE. It is not only a contradiction, it is a sad irony that somehow in the name of economic security we can, according to their approach, pay a company \$1 billion-plus, but we can't find a way to pay for \$1 billion in bioterrorism and food safety. We can't afford that. But we can afford \$1 billion retroactive payments to some of the largest corporations in the country. How ironic. How incredibly misguided that is. Yet that is the debate.

Mr. DORGAN. That totals \$23 billion.

UPON RETURNING FROM THANKSGIVING

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, last week, as I was celebrating Thanksgiving with my family, I was reminded of the history of the holiday. We often forget that Thanksgiving was not always a feast of abundance.

The Pilgrim's first Thanksgiving, in 1621, didn't begin with plates full of turkey and vegetables, but with five small kernels of corn at each setting. For the Pilgrims, it served as a stark reminder of the hardship, struggle, and starvation they had suffered the previous winter.

It wasn't until 1863 that we had our first national Thanksgiving. In the autumn of that year—at the height of the Civil War—Abraham Lincoln proclaimed a national day not to honor abundance, but to remember “all those who have become widows, orphans, mourners or sufferers.”

And so, to me, this Thanksgiving came closer to the original meaning of the day: a day to remember, in the midst of hardship, that we have so much to for which to be thankful. A day to remember, in the midst of comfort, the many who are suffering.

In the last 2 weeks, I have been asked by many people and many of my colleagues what the Senate intends to do before the end of the year.

There are a number of things I would like to get done, but I believe that nothing we do here in the Senate is more important than helping those who are suffering, and passing an economic recovery plan.

Last month, we saw the largest jump in the unemployment rate in 21 years.

Yesterday, a panel of economists announced that our Nation has officially entered a recession.

For the more than 7 million Americans who are out of work, this Thanksgiving was a time of uncertainty.

For all Americans, this has been a season of deep concern about threats to our safety.

America needs an economic recovery plan that lifts our economy, secures our Nation, and remembers those who are suffering.

It is time for us to renew our efforts to pass such a plan.

In the weeks following the September 11 attacks, Democrats and Republicans in both the House and the Senate asked the experts: “What are the most effective steps we can take to shore up our economy?”

Here is what they told us: Put money into the hands of low- and middle-income workers; they are the ones who will spend it quickly. Make sure that workers who have lost their jobs receive unemployment benefits. And cut taxes for businesses—but limit the tax cuts to those businesses that actually help create jobs.

They told us that any plan to stimulate the economy should help people regain the sense of security they need to shop, travel, and invest.

Finally, they said our plan must be affordable, and temporary.

Based on those conversations, the House and Senate budget committees agreed to four principles that should underpin any economic stimulus measure we pass.

With their principles as our foundation, and those discussions as our guide, we began negotiations on how best to help our economy recover.

Unfortunately, Republican leaders in the House chose to withdraw from that effort.

Instead, they pushed through—on a party line vote—a bill that is not a recovery bill at all, but merely another laundry list of tax cuts—with the lion's share going to profitable businesses and wealthy individuals.

It includes next to nothing for laid-off workers—the very people who most need our help. And, with an exploding price tag, it runs the risk of actually hurting our economy in the long term.

In the Senate, we sought a better approach. Even after Republicans in the House walked away from the negotiations, Senator BAUCUS continued to call for bipartisan meetings on the Senate side. In the end, he and his staff held nearly a dozen of them.

He put together a serious bill that: extends unemployment benefits and health care coverage for unemployed workers; cuts taxes for families who didn't get a rebate as part of the tax cut passed earlier this year; cuts taxes and for businesses that will invest and create jobs; and, with provisions authored by our distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator BYRD, strengthens our homeland security with investments in things like infrastructure security and bioterrorism preparedness.

The Wednesday before Thanksgiving, that bill was killed by a budget point of order—a procedural technicality which said that what we are facing is not an emergency.

Republicans said they opposed our economic recovery plan because the bill contained too much spending.

Democrats feel strongly that homeland security provisions should be a part of any economic recovery package.

These measures not only make important investments to secure our food and water supply, ports, bridges, tunnels, as well as our stockpile of antibiotics and vaccines. They also give people the sense of confidence they need to shop, travel, and invest.

The past couple of weeks have reminded us again about the importance of homeland security. We have seen another anthrax death, this time in Connecticut, and the FBI found an anthrax-tainted letter sent to Senator LEAHY. The President's Director of Homeland Security, Tom Ridge, has indicated that billions in additional funds are needed to make America safer. In fact, it was reported that, in the wake of September 11, Federal agencies have asked the White House for \$127 billion more to recover from that assault and beef up security according to David Broder in Sunday's Washington Post.

Defending against anthrax, making our infrastructure safer, protecting our water supply—these things are not pork. They are necessary goals, and an important part of any stimulus package.

But despite my commitment to the homeland security provisions, I have indicated my willingness to negotiate them separately in the name of reaching an agreement.

That idea was rejected.

We also offered to debate only the economic recovery component, if Republicans would allow us an up or down vote on homeland security as an amendment to the DOD appropriations bill.

That proposal was also rejected. That was 2 weeks ago. And since then, I have heard nothing.

We are at the table, ready to negotiate. It is time for Republicans to get serious about reaching a compromise, and come join us at the negotiating table. This is not time to play politics with our economy and our security.

In the meantime, perhaps our Republican colleagues would find it less objectionable if we consider, individually, the components of our plan on which we are all agreed. I will ask unanimous consent at a later time to bring up just the part of our plan that helps laidoff workers.

Extending unemployment insurance is more than the right thing to do, it is the smart thing to do. It puts money into the hands of people who are most likely to spend it immediately. As Robert Rubin has said, unemployment insurance is “a near-perfect stimulus.”

During the first Bush administration, when we were facing a recession, Democrats and Republicans agreed to extend unemployment insurance four times. I believe we can agree to do the same now.

Everyone in this body has said that they want to help the workers. But the voices of delay always claim they want to help the workers.

If you want to help the workers, you will have an opportunity to do so today.

In the days ahead, we can continue our work to protect America's families from terrorism, and discuss what kinds of tax cuts will be most effective in helping the economy.

But when we talk about helping the hardest hit, we need to realize that the

people we are talking about don't have unlimited savings. The holidays are fast approaching, and this delay is a luxury they literally cannot afford.

Our Republican colleagues have a new mantra. They say, "We need paychecks, not unemployment checks."

I think they should talk to some laidoff workers. Yes, they need a paycheck. And like most hard-working Americans, they don't want the Government to do anything for them that they can do for themselves. But right now, many of them need just a little help to make it through one of the most difficult times in their lives.

As we return from Thanksgiving, we have an opportunity to honor the true meaning of the holiday—to remember those left behind and left out, to lift those who are suffering, and to make our Nation—this land for which we are all so thankful—even stronger in the future.

So when people ask me what the Senate intends to do in the next couple of weeks, that is my answer, and that is my goal.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

SENATE PROCEDURE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask the majority leader to stay in the Chamber for just a moment, if he would accord me that courtesy. I have sought to raise a procedural inquiry because of what has just happened. I have been in the Chamber for a little more than an hour waiting my turn. The majority leader took care of very important calendar business as we started the process, and then moved on to other important matters. I have been here for 21 years, and I know that who has the floor may yield for a question. There are also artful ways to ask a question.

I have sought a procedural ruling on whether they really were questions because when you make a statement for a protracted period of time and then end it with a question, the Chair may sustain that, especially when the majority leader is involved.

But I want to make a point with the majority leader's presence and one of the other Senators who was asking questions as a matter of our fair play and procedure. I don't think Senators have to wait for an hour while there are other people who gain recognition

where there really aren't questions but speeches.

I thank the majority leader for staying to listen to my point because it is just possible that this may reoccur sometime in the future.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to make a substantive—

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I would like to ask the majority leader a question before he leaves the Chamber. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPECTER. No, I will not yield. I have been here for more than an hour. There is an issue which I want to raise; that is, a response to very extensive publicity on the cloning issue where there is generalized agreement, which this Senator concurs, in that there should not be human cloning. There is a confusion. I have sought recognition and, as I said, I have waited an hour to note the distinction on what "therapeutic" is and what is frequently used with cloning under the name of therapeutic cloning, which is, in fact, not cloning at all.

More accurately, it is denominated by the scientists as somatic cell nuclear transfer, which, while in the loose jargon is sometimes called therapeutic cloning is, in fact, not cloning at all.

Yesterday, the President spoke out against reproductive cloning. I am entirely in agreement with that. My distinguished colleague from Kansas, Mr. BROWNBACK, and I have had a number of discussions on this issue. I told Senator BROWNBACK that I was going to come to the floor at 10:30 to seek recognition because I wanted him to have the opportunity to be present. I am sorry I said 10:30. I should have said 11:30 to save an hour of time. But I think this is a distinction which needs to be made.

What is involved is a technique which involves taking the genetic material out of an unfertilized egg and inserting, in its place, the DNA of an adult cell. In theory, the egg then uses the genes from the adult cell to direct its development to turn an embryo into an exact genetic copy of the donor of the adult cell. This is done for the purpose of therapy.

If someone has Parkinson's or Alzheimer's, or if someone needs a stem cell replacement related to cancer or to heart disease, this procedure then enables that individual to get a stem cell which is consistent with the body which will not have an adverse impact on the person who is being treated.

Where you talk about the issue of embryos which then produce life, I would never support any approach which took an embryo that was capable of producing life or destined to produce life.

This issue of stem cell research came upon the scene in November of 1998. Then the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and

Human Services, and Education took up the issue, which I chaired at the time, to take a look at what was involved with embryos being created for in vitro fertilization where, customarily, approximately a dozen are created, and three or four might be used. The rest would be subject to being discarded.

The controversy arose because of legislation that had been inserted in an appropriations bill, which originated in our subcommittee, which prohibited Federal funding to extract stem cells from the embryos. But under the ruling of the Department of Health and Human Services several years ago, Federal funding could be used on the research of stem cells after they were extracted. There had been considerable sentiment in the Congress, including the Senate, to use Federal funding on stem cell research because of the tremendous funding which is available to the National Institutes of Health.

Therefore, some 64 Senators last spring and summer signed letters in one form or another saying that they thought there ought to be Federal funding on these stem cell lines. In addition to those 64 Senators, some 12 other Senators had expressed privately to me their view that there should be Federal funding on the stem cells but thought it not advisable, from their own point of view, to put it in writing.

A fair sized ground swell was noted in the Senate to that effect—64 and 12, 76. The President then, as well known, on August 9 at 9 p.m. came down with the decision that the 64 stem cell lines then in existence would be used with Federal funding for stem cell research, and that drew objections from people who thought it went too far on Federal funding to utilize the product of embryos, and others thought it did not go far enough, questioning whether those 64 stem cell lines really would support the necessary research.

What we are dealing with here is stem cells which have the capacity to be used for people who have Parkinson's, to replace diseased cells and cure Parkinson's or, in Alzheimer's, to replace diseased cells and delay the onset of Alzheimer's, if not to cure it, or who have heart disease, to take these stem cells and inject the cells in place of diseased cells, and the potential to save millions upon millions of lives where these embryos were otherwise going to be discarded.

For those who have said these embryos have the potential to create life, my response has been to insert in our appropriations bill \$1 million as a starter to promote adoption of these embryos so that if these embryos can be used to produce life, that would be the highest calling, and if they could all be adopted and used to produce life, then there would not be any embryos available for stem cell extraction, and that would be the preferable course.

If there are to be discarded embryos that are going to be thrown away, then it seems to me obvious it would make